DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 475 896 UD 034 902

TITLE	Myths and Facts about School Vouchers.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	9p.; Produced by People for the American Way Foundation.
AVAILABLE FROM	People for the American Way, 2000 M Street N.W., Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036. Tel: 202-467-4999; Fax: 202-293-2672; e-mail: pfaw@pfaw.org; Web site: http://www.pfaw.org.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Black Students; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; *Educational Vouchers; Elementary Secondary Education; Private Schools; Public Schools; School Choice; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Cleveland Public Schools OH

ABSTRACT

This paper dispels common myths about school vouchers. Myths and facts include: (1) African Americans support private school vouchers (in actuality, most opt for smaller classes and other commonsense reforms, but not vouchers); (2) students who participate in voucher programs do better than public school students (in actuality, more than a decade after the first publicly funded voucher program began, there is no good evidence that vouchers do a better job of educating students than public schools); (3) without vouchers public schools would lack incentives to adopt reforms and improve performance (in reality, many public schools are improving, and voucher programs undercut this improvement); (4) voucher plans for urban school systems were adopted only after all other approaches failed to improve public school quality (in the three states with publicly funded voucher programs, state officials embraced vouchers long before they pursued other approaches); (5) vouchers are needed in Cleveland because the city's public schools are hopeless (while Cleveland's schools are not optimal, positive changes are occurring); and (6) Cleveland vouchers are a bargain for taxpayers since they cost less per student than traditional per-pupil expenditures (the truth is, voucher programs drain critical funds from public schools, and the Cleveland program is far more costly that it appears). (Contains 40 endnotes.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N. Keenan
People for the American Way
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 475 896

PEOPLE FOR THE AMERICAN WAY FOUNDATION

Myths and Facts About School Vouchers

MYTH #1: African-Americans support private-school vouchers.

FACT: African-Americans are eager for reform, but, when given the choice, most of them consistently opt for smaller classes and other common-sense reforms—not vouchers.

Voucher supporters often cite a few polls to make this point—frequently, these include a 1998 Public Agenda poll and a 1999 poll by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies. In doing so, however, voucher advocates conveniently ignore other, more recent polls and indicators. For example, a 2001 Zogby International poll offered African-Americans five options for improving education. Among blacks, the choice of "providing parents with school vouchers" finished dead last of the five options. In fact, African-Americans chose "reducing class sizes" over vouchers by a 7-to-1 margin.[1] The nonpartisan Teachers Insurance Plan commissioned a poll by Opinion Research Corporation in 2001, which found that 61% of blacks and 59% of Latinos would rather see more funding "go toward the public schools than go to a voucher program."[2]

Perhaps the most important 'poll' is the ballot box. In November 2000, voters in Michigan and California handily defeated school voucher referenda. In both states, black and Latino voters rejected the voucher proposals by at least a 2-to-1 margin.[3]

MYTH #2: Students who participate in voucher programs do better than their peers in public schools.

FACT: More than a decade after the first publicly funded voucher program began, there's no good evidence that vouchers do a better job of educating children than public schools.

Last fall, the U.S. General Accounting Office reported that state evaluations found little or no difference between the academic achievement of voucher students and public school students in Cleveland and Milwaukee—the two urban school systems with publicly funded voucher programs.[4]

Indiana University researcher Kim Metcalf, who has spent several years studying the Cleveland program, released a report last year comparing groups of voucher students and public school students from the time they entered first grade through the end of second grade. Over this two-year period, the report found that the public school students demonstrated average learning gains that were *greater* in language, reading and math than the voucher students.[5]

Some voucher supporters have cited data collected by Princeton University researcher Cecilia Rouse to try to advance their case. But these voucher advocates neglect to mention Rouse's 1998 research comparing Milwaukee's voucher schools with the city's P-5 schools—public schools with small class sizes and additional targeted funding. "The results suggest," Rouse wrote, "that students in P-5 schools have math test score gains similar to those in the [voucher] schools, and that students in the P-5 schools outperform students in the [voucher] schools in reading." Rouse went on to explain: "Given that the pupil-teacher ratios in the P-5 and choice schools are significantly smaller than those in the other public schools, one *potential* explanation for these results is that students perform well in schools with smaller class sizes [emphasis in original]."[6]

2000 M Street ♦ Suite 400 ♦ Washington, DC 20036
Telephone 202.467.4999 ♦ Fax 202.293.2672 ♦ E-mail pfaw@pfaw.org ♦ Web site http://www.pfaw.org

UD 034 902

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In other words, improved test scores for these voucher students may have been the result of smaller classes, not attending private schools.

MYTH #3: Without vouchers, public schools will lack the incentive to adopt reforms and improve their performance.

FACT: Many public school systems are improving, but voucher programs—where they exist—undercut this improvement.

Voucher supporters such as researcher Jay Greene claim that vouchers have a positive impact on public schools because the threat they pose leads public schools to improve. In a February 2001 report, Greene asserted that the "Florida A+" voucher program led to public school gains. But researchers at Rutgers University and the University of Colorado at Boulder have identified flaws in Greene's analysis.[7] Researcher Martin Carnoy found that under the accountability system that Florida created *before* vouchers existed, student improvement was greater than after the so-called 'voucher threat' was introduced.[8] Greene also neglected to consider the significant impact of extra resources, both state and local, which were directed towards Florida's 'F'-rated public schools. These resources enabled the schools to extend the school day, week, and year, as well as strengthen professional development for teachers. These elements—combined with accountability measures—may well have been the real cause of improvements in these Florida public schools.[9] Indeed, Greene's own research leads to the conclusion that accountability, testing, and increased resources led to public school improvement in Texas, a state which has no publicly funded voucher program.[10]

Voucher supporters also cite conclusions by Harvard University researcher Caroline Hoxby that competition from private school prompts public school improvements. But Duke University Professor Helen Ladd and other analysts have questioned Hoxby's conclusions. In a study published earlier this year, Ladd observed that other researchers "have used better data and alternative methods and have found no positive effects on public school achievement from competition from private schools."[11]

While pro-voucher forces claim that public schools won't improve without "competition" from voucher programs, the evidence dispels this myth. In fact, public school districts in Los Angeles, Baltimore, Dallas, Portland, Minneapolis, San Diego, Birmingham and Seattle raised both their reading and math scores last year *in every grade tested*—and each of these urban districts did so without the presence of a publicly funded voucher program.[12]

The only real competition that vouchers create is for limited tax dollars. Last year, this situation nearly went from bad to worse when Wisconsin's governor proposed spending more money on Milwaukee's voucher program, while cutting a similar amount from a class-size reduction program with proven results.[13] The Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) reduces student-teacher ratios to 15:1 and provides extra resources for low-income children. SAGE, unlike, vouchers, is proven to raise student achievement. Research shows that SAGE has helped public schools narrow the achievement gap between white and minority students.[14] But it took a determined grassroots campaign by parents, teachers and civic leaders to protect SAGE funding last year. Having to compete for funding with the Milwaukee voucher program means SAGE's impact is needlessly limited.

Voucher supporters point with pride to the money that public school districts are spending to 'compete' with private and/or voucher schools for students. Public schools should regularly reach out to parents, but it's worth considering whether the Milwaukee public schools could have found a better use for the $95,000 it spent this year on an advertising campaign.[15]

MYTH #4: Voucher plans for urban school systems were adopted only after all other approaches failed to improve the quality of these public schools.

FACT: In the three states that have publicly funded voucher programs, state officials embraced vouchers long before they pursued other approaches.

In *The New Republic* (March 18), Jeffrey Rosen states that voucher plans "were adopted largely as a last resort" to help struggling students in urban schools. But calling vouchers "a last resort" assumes that all other approaches have been tried and have failed. This is simply not the case. Whether it's providing the resources that struggling schools need, reducing class sizes or initiating other reforms, the three states with private-school voucher laws have either neglected other, more sound approaches—or have pursued them with limited enthusiasm.

While Florida has enacted the A+ and McKay voucher programs, the Sunshine State has not adequately addressed class size and funding issues. For example, the state's per-pupil funding for public schools has increased by less than two-tenths of 1 percent over the last three years.[16] Adjusted for inflation, the state's per-pupil funding has actually fallen. When *Education Week* released this year's "Quality Counts" analysis of the 50 states, Florida ranked a dismal 44th in providing adequate resources to its public schools.[17]

When Ohio enacted the Cleveland voucher program, the state's Supreme Court had already found Ohio's public school funding formula to be unconstitutional. Today, many years after the court first ruled the funding formula unconstitutional, Cleveland and other low-income districts continue to suffer. State leaders have failed to act responsibly.[18] When asked last year how the legislature planned to comply with the Ohio Supreme Court's rulings, state Senate President Richard Finan was defiant: "I say, let the court figure it out."[19]

Wisconsin, as noted earlier, has an excellent program that reduces class size in the early elementary grades. The Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) program is having a major impact in public schools, helping to close the achievement gap between white and minority students. Consider how many additional low-income children could have benefited if SAGE had received an additional $61 million—the amount spent by Wisconsin officials from 1998-99 to 1999-2000 on the Milwaukee voucher program.[20] Instead of pouring money into the unproven "last resort" of vouchers, the state should be investing much more in proven programs such as SAGE.

MYTH #5: Cleveland vouchers provide an escape hatch for children trapped in failing public schools.

FACT: Most Cleveland voucher students never attended the city's public schools, and many of those who did were *not* attending "failing" public schools.

Last year, an Ohio research institute reviewed information from the voucher program's application forms and what it found was stunning: 79 percent of the students receiving state tuition aid through the voucher program had never attended a Cleveland public school or were already attending a private school.[21]

For those voucher students who can be traced back to the public schools, relatively few of them were actually attending failing schools. Catalyst for Cleveland Schools, a nonpartisan organization that reports on reform efforts, examined the 10 public schools that have lost the most students to vouchers. The Catalyst found that these 10 Cleveland public schools were more likely than other schools to have student test scores *above* the district average—in some cases, even above the state average.[22] Additionally, six of these 10 public schools were classified among the district's "empowered" schools, chosen for overall excellence.[23] While voucher

advocates talk a lot about "choice," a closer look at these 10 public schools reveals that they—combined with the district's other schools—offer parents a wide variety of options. For example, nearly half of these 10 schools are magnet schools at which teachers and staff have developed specialized programs and curricula.[24]

MYTH #6: Vouchers are needed in Cleveland because the city's public schools are hopeless.

FACT: Cleveland public schools aren't what they should be, but positive changes are taking place. Vouchers only undercut the ability of these public schools to improve.

Without question, the Cleveland public schools have serious work to do in ensuring that all of the city's students have access to a quality education. Voucher advocates focus on the negative statistics, but ignore many signs that the city's public schools are laying the groundwork for significant and sustained reforms. For example, Cleveland's 4th-grade reading scores are up 44 percent since 1998.[25] The district has 13 public schools that were honored for high performance in a recent report on high-poverty and high-minority schools by the Education Trust—in fact, more Cleveland public schools were so recognized than in any other urban district in Ohio.[26] Student suspensions in the middle- and high-school grades have declined.[27]

The Cleveland public schools are also making a concerted effort to reach out to parents. Parents *are* getting more involved. The state chapter of the Ohio Parent Teacher Association recently awarded Cleveland's PTA for the largest annual increase in membership (31 percent). During this time, the number of Cleveland public schools with active PTA chapters jumped by more than 30 percent.[28] But efforts to mobilize teachers, parents and the community are undercut when critical funds are diverted to vouchers. In the first five years of the Cleveland voucher program, as much as $27.6 million was diverted to vouchers. These dollars could have improved public schools by funding after-school programs and smaller classes, and easing budgetary pressures—pressures that forced Cleveland officials to eliminate all-day kindergarten for non-magnet schools during the voucher program's first year.[29]

As noted earlier, the state's education funding formula has created additional obstacles. Legislators and the governor haven't adequately responded to the Ohio Supreme Court's repeated rulings that the state's school aid formula is unconstitutional.

MYTH #7: Concerns about Cleveland vouchers' effect on church-state separation are irrelevant since parents are the ones who decide where the voucher goes—not state officials. Besides, religious schools don't really push their faith on students.

FACT: The Cleveland voucher program is extraordinarily skewed to religious schools, and most of those schools weave religious views into subject matter.

In all, 47 of the 50 private schools that participate in the Cleveland voucher program are religious.[30] Parents who don't want their children to have a religiously based education, in reality, have virtually no "choice." In fact, in its December 2000 ruling, the appeals court offered a vivid profile of the participating religious schools, noting that most of them "believe in interweaving religious beliefs with secular subjects" such as science and language arts.[31]

Additionally, no measures have been taken to guarantee that students may opt out of religious activities in these schools that are contrary to their own or their families' beliefs.[32] The appeals court also offered examples of the goals that drive most of these religious schools. One religious school declared in a parental handbook that "the one cardinal objective of education to which all others point is to develop devotion to God," while another school's handbook required students to "pledge allegiance to the Christian flag..."[33]

Some parents agree with these sentiments, and they have every right to choose these schools for their children. But they don't have the right to expect taxpayers to pay the bill. In its decision striking down the voucher program, the appeals court based its ruling on the First Amendment principle of church-state separation.[34] This 'wall' has helped ensure America's unique status as a pluralistic society in which people of all faiths live side by side without the sectarian strife that other nations experience.

MYTH #8: Cleveland vouchers are a bargain for taxpayers since they cost less per student than the normal per-pupil expenditure for the city's public school students.

FACT: Voucher programs drain critical funds from public schools, and the Cleveland program is far more costly than it may appear.

A recent *U.S. News & World Report* article stated that Cleveland voucher students this year "received up to $2,250 in assistance—about a third of what the city spends per public-school pupil." Although the maximum voucher amount under the Cleveland program is $2,250, this figure does not accurately represent the total cost to taxpayers. In addition to the voucher amount, there are numerous program expenses that taxpayers must shoulder, including administration and oversight of the program, transportation, record keeping, and other services.[35]

In fact, it has been estimated that Ohio spends more state tax money per voucher student than it does for nearly 90 percent of the state's public school children.[36] From 1991 through 1998, the state appropriated more money for its private schools ($1.1 billion) than it did to refurbish its public schools ($1 billion).[37] For Ohio to prioritize state funds in this way is significant given that, until recently, federal officials ranked the condition of school facilities in Ohio dead last among all 50 states. As the 2001-2002 school year began, a spokesman for the Ohio School Boards Association called the state's public school infrastructure "a huge, huge problem."[38]

Voucher proponents claim that any loss of per-pupil aid is offset by the money that public schools save because they are no longer educating voucher students. But per-pupil aid is intended to cover much more than an individual student's desk, books and instructional needs. This aid is also intended to cover the overhead and fixed costs of operating a public school—teachers, counselors and other staff; utility costs; maintenance and repairs; computers; and other fixed costs. Losing a small handful of students to vouchers does nothing to change these fixed costs.[39] This was confirmed by a financial audit of the Cleveland public schools by the accounting firm KPMG, which found that, several years into the voucher program, the public schools were "losing [state aid] without a change in their overall operating costs."[40]

Some additional resources from PFAW Foundation and other organizations:

Five Years and Counting: A Closer Look at the Cleveland Voucher Program (Sept. 25, 2001) http://www.pfaw.org/issues/education/reports/cleveland-9-21.pdf

A Painful Price: How the Milwaukee Voucher Surcharge Undercuts Wisconsin's Education Priorities (Feb. 14, 2002) http://www.pfaw.org/issues/education/reports/MilwaukeePainfulPrice.pdf

Community Voice or Captive of the Right: A Closer Look at the Black Alliance for Educational Options (December 2001) http://www.pfaw.org/issues/education/vouchers/factsheets/BAEOReport12_01.pdf

School Vouchers: Examining the Evidence (Martin Carnoy, Economic Policy Institute, 2001)

http://www.epinet.org/studies/vouchers-full.pdf

Market-based Reforms in Urban Education (Helen F. Ladd, Economic Policy Institute, 2002)
http://www.epinet.org/books/educationreform.pdf

ENDNOTES

---

[1] Zogby International interviewed 1,211 adults and oversampled African-American voters from May 23-30, 2001. The poll was requested by the National School Boards Association. Margin of error is +/- 3% for overall sample, +/- 5.7% for African-Americans.

[2] The "Teachers' Insurance Plan National Education Survey" was conducted by Opinion Research Corp., which interviewed 1,046 adults by telephone during May 3-6, 2001. Margin of error is +/- 3%.

[3] California data is from Los Angeles Times poll, which interviewed 3,474 voters at 51 precincts. Margin of error is +/- 3%. Michigan data is from a CBS exit poll, which interviewed 1,213 voters in various parts of the state.

[4] Mary Ann Zehr, "Effect of Vouchers on Achievement Unclear, GAO Says," *Education Week*, October 10, 2001; accessible via Web at: www.edweek.org

[5] Kim Metcalf, "Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship Program, 1998-2000: Technical Report." Bloomington IN: Indiana Center for Evaluation, Indiana University, September 2001.

[6] Cecilia Rouse, "Schools and Student Achievement: More Evidence from the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program," Federal Reserve Bank of New York *Economic Policy Review*, vol. 4, no. 1, March 1998, pp. 61-78. (Pupil-teacher ratios averaged 17.0:1 in the P-5 public schools and 15.3:1 in the voucher schools.)

[7] Gregory Camilli and Katrina Bulkley, "Critique of 'An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program,' " *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, v. 9, no. 7, March 4, 2001, accessed March 9, 2001 via: http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n7/>; Haggai Kupermintz, "The Effects of Vouchers on School Improvement: Another Look at the Florida Data," *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, v. 9, no. 8, March 19, 2001, accessed March 22, 2001 via: http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n8/>, accessed March 22, 2001.

[8] Martin Carnoy, "Do School Vouchers Improve Student Performance?," Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute, 2001.

[9] "False Claims about the Threat of Vouchers and School Improvement in Florida," People for the American Way Foundation, April 2001.

[10] Jay P. Greene, "The Texas School Miracle Is for Real," *City Journal*, vol. 10, no. 3, Summer 2000.

[11] Helen F. Ladd, *Market-Based Reforms in Urban Education*, Economic Policy Institute, 2002; accessible via the Web at: http://www.epinet.org/books/educationreform.pdf

[12] Data is from a study by the Council of Great City Schools, as reported by Robert C. Johnston, "Test Scores Up in Urban Districts, Report Says," *Education Week*, May 30, 2001.

[13] "Punishing Success: The Governor's Proposed Education Budget in Wisconsin and the SAGE and Voucher Programs," a report by People For the American Way Foundation, April 2001, p. 1.

[14] Alex Molnar, Philip Smith, and John Zahorik, "1999-2000 Evaluation Results of the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) Program," Milwaukee, WI: Center for Education Research, Analysis, and Innovation, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, December 2000; Alex Molnar, Philip Smith, and John Zahorik, "1998-99 Results of the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) Program Evaluation," Center for Education Research, Analysis, and Innovation, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Dec. 1999.

[15] Rhea R. Borja, "Sales Pitch: Go to School in Our District," *Education Week*, Feb. 27, 2002.

[16] "Schools or Loopholes?" *St. Petersburg Times*, editorial published March 1, 2002.

[17] Based on data from "Resources: Adequacy," one category in "Quality Counts 2002: Building Blocks for Success," *Education Week*, January 10, 2002; accessed January 2002 via: www.edweek.org/sreports/qc02

[18] "Chronology of the *DeRolph* case," The Ohio Coalition for Equity & Adequacy of School Funding, updated as of December 2001; accessible via the Web at: http://www.ohiocoalition.org/chronology.htm

[19] Doug Oplinger, "Court to State: Spend More, Legislators Balk at Cost," *Akron Beacon Journal*, September 7, 2001.

[20] "A Painful Price: How the Milwaukee Voucher Surcharge Undercuts Wisconsin's Education Priorities," People For the American Way Foundation, February 14, 2002, p.4; accessible via the Web at: http://www.pfaw.org/issues/education/reports/MilwaukeePainfulPrice.pdf

[21] Zach Schiller, "Cleveland School Vouchers: Where the Students Come From," September 2001; available on the web via: http://www.policymattersohio.org

[22] Caitlin Scott, "Better District Schools Lose Students to Vouchers," *Catalyst Cleveland*, December 2001/January 2002, p. 18-19; published by Catalyst for Cleveland Schools.

[23] ibid, p. 19.

[24] ibid.

[25] American Federation of Teachers, "Doing What Works: Improving Big City School Districts," No.12, October 2000, Educational Issues Policy Brief.

[26] Craig D. Jerald, "Dispelling the Myth Revisited: Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of 'High-Flying' Schools," The Education Trust, December 2001, p. 77-79.

[27] "District Chips Away at Suspensions: Are Schools Calmer?" *Catalyst Cleveland*, Dec. 2001/Jan. 2002, p. 4.

[28] "PTA Growth Brings Award," *Catalyst Cleveland*, December 2001/January 2002, p. 20.

[29] "The Cleveland Voucher Program: Who Chooses? Who Gets Chosen? Who Pays?" A Report by the American Federation of Teachers, 1997, p. ii.

[30] Amy Hanauer, "Cleveland School Vouchers: Where the Students Go," Policy Matters Ohio, January 2002; the first sentence under the section "Background" notes that there are 50 participating voucher schools, and Table 1 of the report shows that the number of participating secular schools has dropped to three. Thus, 50-3=47. The report is accessible at: http://www.policymattersohio.org/WhereStudentsGo.pdf

[31] *Simmons-Harris et al v. Zelman*, decision filed on December 11, 2000 by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, 2000 FED App. 0411P (6th Cir.). This information can be found in the 5th paragraph under Section I of the decision. The decision can be accessed at: http://law.about.com/library/docs/bl_ohio_vouchers.htm

[32] "Five Years and Counting: A Closer Look at the Cleveland Voucher Program," People For the American Way Foundation, September 25, 2001. This section of the report can be accessed at: http://www.pfaw.org/issues/education/epromises/liberty.html

[33] *Simmons-Harris et al v. Zelman*, decision filed on December 11, 2000 by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, 2000 FED App. 0411P (6th Cir.). This information can be found in the 5th paragraph under Section I of the decision. The decision can be accessed at: http://law.about.com/library/docs/bl_ohio_vouchers.htm

[34] *Simmons-Harris et al v. Zelman*, decision filed on December 11, 2000 by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, 2000 FED App. 0411P (6th Cir.). In Section II, the court writes: "The courts do not make educational policy ... The design or specifics of a program intended to remedy the problem of failing schools and to rectify educational inequality must be reserved to the states and the school boards within them, with one caveat ... the determinations of states and school boards cannot infringe upon the necessary separation between church and state." The decision can be accessed at: http://law.about.com/library/docs/bl_ohio_vouchers.htm

[35] "Five Years and Counting: A Closer Look at the Cleveland Voucher Program," People For the American Way Foundation, September 25, 2001.

[36] Doug Oplinger and Dennis J. Willard, "Vouchers Costing Ohio," *Akron Beacon Journal*, March 27, 1998. Part of the *Akron Beacon Journal* investigative series "Whose Choice?" culminating five years of investigative reporting by the two authors.

[37] Michael Hawthorne, "State Aid to Private Schools Up: Public Districts Feel Slighted," *Cincinnati Enquirer*, March 29, 1998.

[38] "Enrollment Booms, But Buildings Implode," *The Blade*, September 1, 2001.

[39] According to Milwaukee public schools data, there were approximately 160 schools in the 1999-2000 school year. During the same school year, there were 1,934 students in the Milwaukee voucher program who had been enrolled at one of the city's public schools the prior year, according to State of Wisconsin's Department of Public Instruction. Based on this data, an average of only 12 students *per school* left the Milwaukee public schools to accept vouchers—a figure that repudiates the claim that vouchers lower the operating costs of public schools. (SOURCE: "Milwaukee Parental School Choice Program: Milwaukee Parental School Choice Facts and Figures for 1999-2000," accessed February 24, 2000 via: www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dfm/sms/mpcfnf99.html.)

[40] "Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program: Final Management Study," Prepared by KPMG LLP, September 9, 1999, p. 9-5.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").